DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 684 JC 720 000

AUTHOR Collins, Charles C.
TITLE The Induction of Community College Instructors: An Internship Model.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; Inservice Teaching; *Internship Programs; *Junior Colleges; Teacher Interns; Teacher Orientation; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

To handle the thousands of new students expected to flood the nation's community colleges, many more master teachers will be needed if the potential of high-risk students is to be maximized. Such teachers are not being created by present pre-service and in-service training or being developed at colleges and universities. The place to make subject-area specialists into talented instructors is the community college itself. A first year of teaching can be a metamorphosis into quality teaching through a highly instructive internship. This internship model suggests that first-year teachers spend an intensive month in pre-service training under the direction of a Professional Development Officer. They should then have a light teaching load the first semester to allow time for extensive in-service training with a master teacher and progress in the second semester to more teaching responsibilities with exposure to additional master teachers and training. An example of dollar cost and long-term savings applied to Contra Costa Junior College District (California) is provided along with specifications for implementation of the plan. (MN)

ED056684

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE INDUCTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS:

AN INTERNSHIP MODEL

JC 720 000

CHARLES C. COLLINS
PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA--BERKELEY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

Jan. 6 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

THE INDUCTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS: AN INTERNSHIP MODEL

The community colleges have survived the 1968 attack by Jencks and Riesman but continue to smart from their arrogant and stinging criticism: "...grew up with little sense of distinctive institutional purpose"; "...became sufficiently numerous to hold meetings with one another...and began to look for some distinctive ideology to justify their activities"; "...teach both subjects and students whom most scholars regard as worthless"; "...most community college instructors continue to teach what they were taught in four-year colleges, immunized from new ideas both by isolation and by the prestige of the models they are emulating."[1] This last barb, that instructors without Ph.D.'s give first priority to teaching the few potential Ph.D.'s that come their way, strikes home. It scoffs at the proud myth that junior college instructors could "make silk purses out of sows' ears" because they, unlike university professors, really knew how to teach.

Perhaps the glaring elitist assumptions of the Jencks and Riesman argument germinate their own rebuttal making counterattack unnecessary. Nonetheless, some of Jencks's and Riesman's most telling shots have also been fired by the populists they scorn, by educators who hold that one

man's life is as important as any other man's life, by men and women who have devoted their professional lives to community college education. Some of their challenges are indeed hard to answer. Community college students as a group are, in fact, less academically able than four-year college students. Less able students do require more able teachers if the outcomes are to be at all comparable. Community college instructors probably do have lesser command of their subject matter than four-year college professors. Community college instructors probably do have less time for the development of courses and for working out teaching-learning strategies. There is no substantial reason to believe that community college instructors have greater devotion to mankind in general or to their students in particular. Being hired as an instructor in a community college is not an act of God that miraculously transforms the lucky person into a talented, devoted, effective teacher. If teaching in community colleges is to be something special, is to be the compensatory factor that makes the unequal equation equal, then preparation of the instructors cannot be left to chance--nor, as will be argued in this paper, to the universities.

Some General and Some Specific Indictments

Jencks and Riesman say that a major flaw in the whole community college movement is that the practitioners have

lost track of what their own goals are. Although the words taste bitter, those instructors and administrators who have devoted their careers to the nurturing of community colleges would have to agree. They lament this straying of the eyes from the target and could explain, probably better than Jencks and Riesman, what went awry.

When junior colleges were small enough so that all staff members could interact, there was an identification with the institution and a commitment to the institutional goals which all had had a part in hammering out. With explosive growth this institutional esprit began to dissipate and the college began to fragment into sharply separated departments. As new staff members flooded in they found the familiar and narrow goals of their departments much more comfortable and more compatible with their own collegiate experience than the comprehensive and complex goals of the institution. It was much simpler to identify with one's discipline than to identify with anything as vague and messy as the self-actualization of each member of a wildly diverse student body. It seemed easier and sensible to give first priority to teaching the transfer students who were going to major in one's own specialty. With knowledge doubling and tripling every decade, there was a natural desire to become more and more specialized. There was an increasing compulsion to be a knowledge dispenser

to those who could quickly grasp it rather than to be a teacher bent on increasing the understanding of all. So, more often than many would like to admit, community college faculty became second-rate models of university professors, reshaped general education to meet transfer standards and developed curriculum and course content geared to the one-third of the students whom they often lovingly referred to as "college material."

There are now over 1000 community colleges spread throughout all fifty states with a staff of approximately 96,000 teachers, counselors, and administrators trying to give training and enlightenment to over two million students. The total faculty in 1967-68 represented more than a 375 percent increase over what it was in 1957-58.[2] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education estimates that by 1980 there will be 3.6 to 4.3 million students enrolled in these two-year colleges.[3] The mind boggles to think of the percentage increase of faculty over the next decade. Even more disturbing than the question of quantity is the question of quality. Certainly if reliance is placed on present selection pools and present methods of preparation the outlook for the decade ahead is indeed bleak.

Only seven of the fifty states require any certificate or credential for junior college teachers. One of the seven is California, and its pro forma credential comes upon request

to those with a master's degree (or equivalent), who are free of tuberculosis and communism, and who can pay the $20 fee.[4] Of course credentials do not assure quality, and the above facts on credentialing are not presented in disparagement. The point being made is that the only minimum to quality control of faculty in the nation's community colleges is the prima facie evidence of subject area competence; i.e., a master's degree or equivalent in a specialty field.

Community college professionals are well aware that "command of subject" is not the heart of the matter. Most instructors are, if anything, over-prepared in their specialty. The problem lies in the sharing of knowledge, attitudes, understanding, and wisdom between teacher and students. The problem is wider and more complex even than this, as will later be described. However, the problem's crux is not insufficient command of subject matter.

Hiring practices give testimony of the awareness that education is infinitely more than a process of the well informed telling the poorly informed. In the academic year 1969-70, there were 1781 full-time faculty members hired in the California community colleges. Only 80 of this number held the doctor's degree. The richer and/or more attractively located community colleges "stole" 392 faculty members from poorer or less attractive colleges. Some 546 were recruited

from the secondary schools while 344 had won their teaching spurs in four-year colleges. Although 459 had newly minted 1968-69 M.A.'s, only 129 of the total number hired (1781) had no prior teaching experience.[5]

College districts pay premium salaries for experienced teachers because they have little evidence or faith that the universities and senior colleges are providing much quality pre-service professional preparation. And, most community colleges are painfully aware that they themselves will provide next to nothing in in-service professional development.

There is, of course, opportunity for pre-service preparation for people who want to teach in community colleges. California is probably fairly typical and T. Stanely Warburton was able to find and catalogue programs of preparation in the independent colleges and universities, in the California State Colleges, and in the University of California. However, more often than not, these were limited to a course or so and, in a few instances, some directed teaching.[6] The University of California, Berkeley, for example, has an excellent three-year doctoral program complete with internship for experienced and qualified professionals who want to move into community college administration--but, has only one 3-hour, one quarter course for prospective instructors in community colleges.

This dismal picture of pre-service preparation is explainable. Young graduate students do not want to be burdened with education courses. They are eager to finish college and begin working, and, if minimum qualifications are the M.A. in a subject area, they will tunnel through their highly specialized department as directly and as quickly as possible. In 5 or maybe 6 years, they will emerge with a shiny degree in hand, to offer themselves as qualified community college instructors. Ridiculous as it may be, some applicants have never seen a community college until they go to one looking for a job. Again, to single out California, if pre-service preparation were a viable option, there would certainly have been more than 40 people out of the 1781 hired in 1969-70 who came fresh from junior college practice teaching or internship. College districts would not have burdened their budgets by paying higher salaries to buy experience in 1604 out of 1781 hirings.[5]

The nationwide picture of in-service training is equally depressing. The term "in-service" in itself is anathema to many faculty members. Inexperienced faculty members are so engulfed by the 12-15 hour teaching load with two, maybe three, spanking new course preparations that they can hardly come up long enough to yell "help!" And, if they do call for assistance, who is there to answer? As to older faculty members,

they look with jaundiced eyes at the occasional superficial attempts to "up-grade" them. This is not to say that either experienced or inexperienced faculty would be antagonistic to professional development if it were top quality and if there were time to really pursue it.

The two reasons it is not often top quality are that little if any of the budget is allocated for it and responsibility for planning and carrying out a first-rate program most often falls between the administrative cracks. There is no one there really to do it. The college president and the dean of instruction both mean well and often say kind words about professional development of the staff, but they know that they have neither the time nor the preparation to carry it off. So, it remains high on the rhetorical priorities and low on the behavioral priorities.

Needless to say, some senior colleges and universities have passable to good pre-service preparation, and some community colleges have put their money and talent where their mouth is, coming up with creative, well-accepted, in-service staff development. Who can deny, though, that these are the exceptions and not the rule? Further, even "good" pre-service programs may be "bad." These programs are often too previous to be relevant; they are schooling not education; and they are learning about education rather than living education. And

maybe even "good" in-service programs are really only palliatives, too little and too late to correct for the improper induction of people into the profession of community college teaching.

The Internship Model: Structure

It is incredible that postsecondary education has never paid much attention to the education of its practitioners. It is ironic when an educational institution puts such little value on educating itself. To be sure, colleges have always sought teachers with command of the subject area, and in senior colleges and universities those bright enough to earn Ph.D.'s (the guarantee of competence in the specialty) have often been clever enough to be well-organized, articulate, even witty dispensers of information. For the smart students who populate the elitist universities, lecturing could be substituted for teaching and usually no great harm was done. Further, many professors, the self-critical, thoughtful, dedicated ones, have educated themselves to be great teachers. The point, of course, is that the development of a teacher should occur by design, not be chance.

It is folly for community colleges to act upon the adage that what is good enough for the universities is good enough for them. With a student population that ranges from low normal to genius, with a curriculum that includes everything

from 7th grade arithmetic through the calculus, and with a year-after-year attrition rate that looks like the mortality figures for the Battle of Verdun, it is patently ridiculous for community colleges to assume that competence in a subject area is synonymous with competence as a teacher. Quality through mimicry is not quality at all.

On the other hand, consider the possibilities of internship. Students of medicine need an internship to qualify as doctors, students of dentistry need an internship to qualify as dentists, students of all forms of mechanics need an apprenticeship to qualify as journeymen, and subject area specialists need an internship to qualify as community college teachers. Community colleges should listen to Ivan Illich's warning that schooling is interfering with education[7] and to Paul Goodman's call for designing a twentieth century apprenticeship system.[8]

How might this be brought about? It is proposed that community colleges undertake to prepare their own teaching staff. It is proposed that community colleges hire people with a good general education and a subject area specialty, and, by means of a year-long internship, transform them into community college instructors. It is further suggested that a top quality internship system for new instructors will serve to re-vitalize, up-date, and up-grade the entire professional staff.

To begin at the beginning: Early in the spring hiring season, community colleges would canvass the graduate schools for M.A. candidates, or post-M.A. graduate students, who appear to have high promise. The same search would be made in the professions, in business, and in industry to find applicants with high potential for teaching in the specialized career programs of the community college. The recruitment net would bring in as many as possible, but the screening process would be thorough and rigorous in every regard. The first winnowing would be done by the dean of instruction and the professional development facilitator (to be described later) and would involve close scrutiny of objective background data as well as interviews leading to subjective, holistic, gut-level reactions to the applicants. The candidates would demonstrate their subject area competence to the satisfaction of faculty members from equivalent or similar disciplines. The candidates would show they can relate to students by relating to the students on the selection committee. The candidates would be probed on their breadth and depth of general education by all who participate in the selection process. Selection would be made by a screening committee of administrators, faculty, and students and should be based on the process of progressive consensus. Finally, the top contenders for each position would be seen again by the dean of instruction and the professional

development facilitator for a frank exchange on the whole internship system and for an opportunity to stipulate the conditions of employment.

On the plus side for the intern, assurance would be given of a full-time salary at the first step on the column of the salary schedule that his academic or equivalent background would warrant. More important, he would be offered, not just the chance to sink or swim, but a program rich in opportunity to quickly develop as a self-respecting, self-fulfilling professional in community college education. He would not have "instant tenure" yet he would know that the institution had committed itself to his development, had invested in making him worthy of tenure. He would be shown that the college was enlisted on his side, doing its best to make him a successful teacher, and was not merely a judge who had given him a probationary year to show that he could, unassisted, meet some test whose criteria and standards were vague, if not unknown, to him. Instead of being overwhelmed with three or four preparations and a fifteen-hour weekly teaching load, the conditions of employment would call for one preparation and six to nine hours of teaching during the first semester and two preparations with nine to twelve hours of teaching during the second semester.

The college would grant a one-year internship contract which would call for full salary and would bind the college to provide the intern with a year of intensive professional development. The men and women so employed would legally serve under an internship or provisionary credential. The college would hire them according to its projected needs so the expectancy would be a continued contract under a regular credential. However, since this would be more of a training contract than an employment contract, the usual guarantees of tenure would not apply. The college would, of course, do its best to develop the intern to a standard where it would be eager to give him a regular contract. This would be no idle promise, for it is the only way in which the college's investment would pay off. The college would know this, and the intern would know this, so they would both be working toward the same end with neither exploiting the other.

The stipulated work year for interns would be from August 1 to the end of the spring term of the first academic year. That would be one month longer than the actual work year of regular instructors. This is justified on the basis of the intern's need for intensive orientation before class work with students begins, and on the quid pro quo basis that he make the effort to get a head start since he would be paid as a professional while, in fact, he is still an amateur. The

month of August would be devoted to one long and wide-ranging seminar led by the professional development facilitator in which the first spiral of the intern's education as teacher would be traversed. The seminar would continue throughout the academic year with its content and sophistication level geared to the interns' stages of development.

During the fall semester the intern would have one preparation (perhaps two if they are very closely related or were varying activities such as in physical education) and would present this course at least twice (six hours) and perhaps three times (nine hours). The repetition of presentation would, of course, give the intern opportunities to try differing teaching tactics and learning strategies on varying groups.

The intern would, during the initial weeks of the semester, be under the tutelage of his department chairman or division chief and would be invited to seek help from any experienced faculty member within that department or division. Once the intern found a professional colleague with whom he could relate and from whom he could learn, then this experienced faculty member would be asked by the professional development facilitator and the dean of instruction to serve as day-to-day advisor and as general mentor to the intern for that semester. It is suggested that such experienced faculty members be

awarded a $750 honorarium in appreciation of their assistance and in recognition of their added burden during the semester. In addition to the specialized help from the experienced faculty member and from the department head or division chief, the intern would have the constant, if more general, assistance and support of the professional development facilitator.

In the second semester, the intern would have one new preparation and one continuing preparation, and his teaching load would be increased to nine, perhaps twelve, hours. He would be asked to seek out a different experienced faculty member as guide and helpmate, thus exposing himself to different perceptions, varying criticisms, and a second teaching style. The experienced faculty member working with the intern during the second semester would also be awarded a $750 honorarium in recognition of his contributions to the college and, indeed, to the whole profession. Needless to say, the group and individual growth experiences, planned and led by the professional development facilitator, would continue through both the fall and spring semesters.

Evaluation of the intern, in the sense of non-threatening growth experiences, would be done by the intern himself, by the professional development facilitator, by the experienced faculty members with whom he works, and by his fellow interns. No doubt, even this supportive evaluation would lead those

who are clearly not cut out for teaching to an insightful recognition of this and a quiet departure. Such cases, though they should be few, represent a financial loss to the college district and, no doubt, a personal loss to the intern. Even so, the college would want and should have a judgmental evaluation of every intern before offering him a regular contract as a professional instructor. This judgmental evaluation would be made by those not directly and intimately involved in the internship program.

It is recommended that an evaluation panel be established for each intern. The dean of instruction would serve on all such panels. Other members would be the respective department chairman and/or division chief, one faculty member appointed by the dean, and one faculty member appointed by the faculty senate. This panel would follow the progress of the intern throughout the whole year. Classroom performance would be only one, and not the most important, of many standards the panel would use in arriving at its recommendation. The primary overriding criterion should be the intern's commitment to the goals of the institution and his existing and potential contributions to the attainment of these goals.

The panel would look closely at the logic and relevance of the course objectives, at the instructional means developed to achieve these objectives, and at any behavioral evidence of

success or failure in meeting these objectives. Pertinent evidence from any college-wide student evaluation system would be welcomed. Specific factual testimony, as opposed to overall judgment, might be sought, even subpoenaed, from the experienced faculty members who worked with the intern. However, to guarantee a clean separation of staff function from line function, the professional development facilitator should be excluded from any role in judgmental evaluation. Even with the experienced faculty members, it should be made abundantly clear that these friends and advisors of the intern have no official voice in decisions on retention or dismissal. The evaluation panel, like the selection committee, would use the process of progressive consensus and, by late March or April, would be ready to make its recommendation to the president of the college.

The Internship Model: Content

The content of the internship experience should be all that which present pre-service and in-service programs so conspicuously fail to provide. The content should be all that is presently needed to fill the cavernous void that young, inexperienced holders of master's degrees now bring to their first community college teaching position.

The content should describe an upward spiral in which the bottom circles provide the broad philosophic base, but one in

which the tightening spiral does keep circling back to fundamentals. The spiral metaphor is an accurate one, for the learning process for the interns, as they will find to be true for their students, is not so much additive as it is encompassing. The learning process is not just piling up facts and concepts and techniques and skills one on top of the other; it is the connecting of relationships into larger and larger networks of meaning.

On the first day of their internship and on every subsequent day, the interns would be challenged to examine their philosophic postulates and to measure every experience in the light of them. In this August seminar, the professional development facilitator would oblige each intern to plumb the emotional and rational bases for his assumptions about the nature of man, for his perception of the human condition, and for his beginning understanding of the relationship of these to the educational context. No one would be excused from looking squarely--and publicly--at what he really believes, and the professional development facilitator would be dogged in his determination to make each person, day by day, see more clearly how his fundamental beliefs are determinants of his professional behavior. A case in point: if the fledgling teacher believes that all men have a largely untapped potential to learn and that the human condition makes ignorance of the

many a danger to all others, then he is going to think twice about using a grading system based on winners and losers and of his serving as society's culling machine.

At the same time the intern is led to look inward at his own philosophic assumptions, he would be invited to look outward at the philosphic underpinnings which support the goals of the institution. This would be a critical appraisal, not an indoctrination of orthodoxy. Disagreements will, of course, be many, and they should be welcomed. Nonetheless, there are limits to incompatibilities, and when these limits are approached, the intern should be led to make a conscious choice either to get out or to enter community college education dedicated to changing the institutional goals. Again, the point is being stressed that there has to be commitment by the professional staff to the institutional goals or the college begins to fragment and the forward thrust gets lost. Understanding of and emotional attachment to the goals of the community college are the crucial elements not now being engendered by either preservice or in-service preparation and are the compelling argument for community colleges to invest the time and effort and money to prepare their own staffs.

The functions that a community college performs should evolve from the philosophic investigations into purpose. The inquiries into purpose should be ramifying, pervasive,

continuing, and never-ending. The orthodox listing of functions--transfer, technical/vocational, general education, developmental or remedial, student personnel and community services--developed from assumptions about the educational role of the junior college within its community. At one time, and not long ago, these functions seemed to be the natural order of things and were ordained to last forever. Now they are all under challenge with calls for a revamping or a reordering of priorities and, most particularly, for a different sized slice of the budgetary pie. True, any new teachers would eventually learn all this simply from living it. What is recommended here is that interns look into the functions to be served by the community college and appraise the philosophic justification for them. Haphazard inquiry leads to haphazard conclusions and thoughtful inquiry leads to thoughtful conclusions. Another case in point: teaching interns should see both the historic and the potential role played by those in student personnel in making community colleges student-centered. They should be led to think about ways of making the student personnel function fulfill its promise rather than join the carpers and those who would cannibalize the student personnel services budget.

As a means to heightening awareness of college functions and the relationship of the functionaries to students, interns would, on a rotational basis, spend several hours each week in

various college offices. At best, the intern would perform work assignments and, at least, would make direct observations. His reactions and observations would be fed back into the seminar and would be critically discussed. The constant question would be asked, "How well does this office serve the student?" To make this into a professional development experience not only for the interns but also for the functionary (president? dean of student personnel? athletic director? registrar?), the officer in charge of the function under scrutiny would be invited to participate in the seminar.

Inseparable from the need for examination of personal philosophy and institutional philosophy is the need for a tough-minded facing up to the implications for education of the great societal issues that dominate this last third of the twentieth century: ant-hill populations, threats of irreversible ecological disruptions, the promises and perils of cybernation, racial conflict, deep and systemic alienation, living with the possibility of nuclear annihilation, the erosion of credibility between the generations and between the governors and the governed, the Frankenstein possibilities of science and technology--all of those terrors that are contributing to the national and, indeed, to the world malaise. If personal philosophy says, "I am involved in mankind," if the evidence is compelling that mankind is in jeopardy, and if institutional

philosophy calls for curriculum to be based on that which is most important, then, indeed, every college must become a college for survival, and every instructor will, in his own way, need to address himself to the issues of survival.

It seems too obvious to mention that community college instructors should know as much as possible about the people they are trying to teach. They ought to know what state and nationwide research has uncovered, what their own institutional research office has assembled, and they should know the methods by which they can study their own students. The fact is that most community college instructors have had no pre-service preparation on the students who will be the focus of their professional lives. Even if they had, they would have found such research data on students rather academic, like free-floating facts without any experience to which to anchor them. The time to learn about students is when one is looking for answers on how to deal with them. In-service study of the student is the right timing, but it has to be more than the traditional few hours of September orientation and the occasional faculty meeting that is now euphemistically called in-service training. Study of the student should be deep and should offer the means (methodology) of making it continuous, hence its centrality in this internship model.

One deepening and broadening insight that comes with continuous study of the community college student is that different people learn in different ways and that the same person learns different content in different ways. It takes a perverse wrongheadedness to continue to think and act as if teaching and lecturing are synonymous terms. Any good teacher in the community college setting has, sooner or later, begun to be curious and to read and to think about how people learn. Strategies and tactics in teaching have to be based on an informed notion of how learning occurs. Some people have thought about this in a very systematic way, and their hypotheses, their collection of evidence, their evolving theories of learning deserve to be studied.

No doubt, the old critics of education courses on learning theory were right; such courses were too abstract and were too previous to have much relevance to the student who was one or two years away from his first teaching experience. However, for people who are finding the essential meaning and significance of their lives in the teaching they are doing in the classroom, for these people learning theory is not too abstract. They want some theoretical basis from which they can begin to solve those challenging, even frustrating, learning-teaching equations which they face daily. Learning theory would be relevant to the interns in this model. The focus of the

whole internship would be on who is the student and how does he learn.

The interns should be made keenly aware that they are entering a profession and that they have an obligation to know a great deal about that profession. They should know the ethics of that profession. They should know the rights and privileges of that profession and the reciprocal responsibilities that follow. The interns should know how community college education fits into the whole schema of higher education and also how and why there are discontinuities, bad fits, and direct conflicts of interest. They should soon learn how community colleges are financed and how the limitations of finance requires everyone to become students of the budget, for budgetary allocations are the ultimate measure of philosophic priorities.

The interns should acquire an accurate picture of the governance of the college from the state coordinating body, through the district board of trustees and superintendent, to the president and the campus administration. The interns would, of course, be members of departments or divisions, and they would study both the functional and disfunctional qualities of these sub-systems. They would be quickly introduced to the standing committees of the college and, after close observation, would use their seminar to critique the varying roles and the efficacy of these committees. The interns would

soon tune in on the prevailing politics of the campus, but that is not enough; their sophistication in internal campus politics, in the politics of professional associations, and in the state and national politics of the community college movement, should be made quickly and thoroughly.

Most of the content of the internship thus far described resembles the reading and discussion that might occur in a seminar. That impression is essentially correct and no apology is offered. Its importance is self-evident, and the seminar approach seems like a sensible way to get at it. There would be initial and superficial coverage of every topic mentioned during the long August seminar, but the professional development facilitator would keep leading the interns into deeper and deeper discussions of these same topics during the daily seminar meetings of the fall semester and the thrice weekly seminar meetings of the spring semester. But there would be a good deal more content during the year-long internship than that heretofore described; content more personal, more directly related to teaching, of more immediate help to the interns, and more affective than cognitive. Some of it would require skills and competencies beyond that of the experienced faculty members or the professional development facilitator and would require some expenditure for outside specialists.

Not many beginning teachers escape from anxiety. Too many experienced teachers carry anxiety with them throughout their careers because they had no help in overcoming it during their formative years. Often their defenses against anxiety force them into behavior molds that, though counter-productive, they cannot break. For this very important reason, it is recommended that the interns have some professional help in ventilating their fears and in working them through to the point of handling them with some ease and grace. It may be that the professional development facilitator would be so skilled in group processes that he could serve in this capacity. This would put him in a very mixed role, however, and it would probably be better to engage an outside group leader well-trained in encounter and other group processes. An occasional one day retreat, probably to include the experienced faculty members along with their interns and perhaps also the professional development facilitator, would be well worth the doing and an expense well worth the paying. A long weekend retreat between the fall and spring semesters would be used for recapitulation, consolidation of learning, personal assessment, and a girding of the loins for the second half of the internship.

Hopefully, a compensatory effort would be made to recruit interns from among Black, Chicano, and other minority groups. They are certainly going to be needed if the "new students"

in community colleges are to be well served. The minority teacher needs some help in working through the unique problems he faces, particularly with students from his own racial stock as well as with the majority students. The Causasian intern faces at least half of this problem in reverse: how can he relate to the Black or Chicano or Asiatic students? And he, along with all other Caucasian staff members, needs increased sensitivity to what the Third World movements are all about. It would be of benefit to the interns and to the entire staff if the professional development facilitator were to arrange for occasional seminars or larger meetings designed to achieve better understanding among the races, and to capture sincere support for ethnic studies within the college.

One of the first tasks on which the interns would need help is the creative challenge of designing the course plan. The professional development facilitator would help each intern think through the serious questions: what changes in behavior are desired? what affective changes in attitudes and values are expected? what is important to teach? what is possible to teach? what will be the nature of the students who take this course? what content should be used? what are the resources available? what are the learning problems that can be anticipated? what are the various teaching tactics available? what are the relationships of this course to all other knowledge? and what evaluation devices would be valuable to the

students and to the instructor? The department chairman or division chief and later the experienced faculty member would help the intern to refine this general course plan into more detailed ends and means, would insist that it be shaped with definite structure, yet would rely upon the intern's own personality and style to give it spark and vitality and put his personal stamp upon it.

Long before any intern would perform before a class, he would have the experience of performing before his peers--and before a video tape camera. Early in August, the professional development facilitator would introduce the interns to micro-teaching episodes. He would demonstrate a teaching tactic and then encourage each intern to work out a variation of this tactic compatible with his own personality. Each intern would teach his fellow-interns and would face and profit from an immediate critique. He could also get the quick feedback of watching and hearing himself on the video tape. This, as anyone who has tried it knows, can be a devastating experience, for the oddities of speech, the mannerisms, the flaws in reasoning, the loss of presence, the failures to relate are all there, incontrovertible and damning--until it is erased and then the intern finds that without serious risk he has a second chance, and a third and a fourth, to see what he is doing wrong and to gradually correct it. By October, when he is well into

his teaching, he should be tough enough to have a class teaching hour video recorded and made available for his own evaluation, for peer evaluation, and for evaluation by his experienced faculty member and by the professional development facilitator.

No doubt, experience in changing this hypothetical model into a reality would suggest additions to this curriculum for the education of teaching interns in community colleges. No doubt, walking tours or even living experiences in the inner city would be of value for those who will teach in urban colleges. Visits to innovative programs in neighboring colleges, if properly handled, could be most stimulating. A program of reading in the literature of the community college has been implied throughout many aspects of this internship. As this reading sparked special interest in subjects such as teacher evaluation, or behavioral objectives, or programmed learning, or computer-assisted instruction, or the proper use of paraprofessionals, or the cluster college concept, or the interdisciplinary approach to teaching--these or any topical interests could be exploited further by bringing in a knowledgeable consultant to lay it all out for the uninitiated and to be ready to engage the skeptical. Naturally, all interested staff members would be invited along with the interns which is an illustration of what was meant by the statement, "It is further suggested that an on-going internship system will serve

to re-vitalize, up-date, and up-grade the entire professional staff." Suffice it to say, without adding other possible learning experiences to this internship model, if teachers can "be made" and are not "just born," such an internship year has a 100 percent better chance of "making" top quality community college instructors than the nothing they are now getting in most pre-service and most in-service training programs.

Who Will Teach the Teachers?

Frequent mention has been made of the leadership of the professional development facilitator without describing who he is, where he comes from, and what his qualifications are. Attention will now be turned to this new position envisioned for community colleges.

Put in the most general yet boldest terms, the professional development facilitator would be a person qualified by personality, by experience, and by training to be an educational change agent. The term "consultant" might be as accurate as "facilitator" but suggests that he is an outsider brought in on occasion to consult. This is not what is proposed. There would, hopefully, be outside consultants brought in when their expertise became crucial to the progress of the interns. However, this facilitator of professional development would be an inside consultant, a staff officer of the college

or of the district whose single, but most significant responsibility, would be to help novice teachers become journeyman teachers and to help journeyman teachers to become master teachers.

From experience and from preparation, this facilitator of staff development would be a scholar in the field of community college education and would be a specialist in curriculum and instruction. He (or she) would be what deans of instruction cannot be because of the breadth and immediacy of the administrative demands inherent in that position; namely, a master teacher and a learning theorist who would devote himself to helping teachers, particularly novice teachers, in solving the learning-teaching equation. He would be more than this--he would be an analyst of the societal forces at play in the immediate and in the larger community and, in parallel, an analyst of the implications of these societal forces for what is taught (curriculum) and how it is taught (instruction). He would be a student of social change and would be an idea man on how educational experiences can prepare people to meet predictable changes. He would be the closest thing yet available to a practicing philosopher of community college education, and, in this capacity, he should exert his most profound influence in planning for and effecting the proper induction of new

staff members. He should qualify through some experience and preparation to be consultant to the counselors and librarians as well as to the teaching staff.

By the foregoing description of this position, it sounds as if the advertisement for candidates should read, "Only paragons need apply." Fortunately, this is not the case, for paragons of anything are in short supply. There are such people, probably several on every campus, who could step into this facilitator role tomorrow and would only be doing in an official and concerted way that which they have done for years in an unofficial, extra-duty, boot-legged way. This is not to say that those with a natural talent and a predilection for this work in teacher development could not profit from formal preparation. It is the intention of Programs in Community College Education, University of California, Berkeley, to initiate perhaps a doctoral, perhaps a shorter non-doctoral, program to prepare just such community college change agents.

However demonstrable the value of a professional development facilitator might be, small community colleges may not be able to afford to make this a full-time position. In such cases, the facilitator would indeed be a consultant brought in as frequently as the budget would allow from the closest university or state college. Another possibility for small colleges that are within commuting distance would be to band

together in a consortium and each contribute an equitable proportion of the salary and other expenses of a full-time professional development facilitator who would serve all colleges in that consortium. A large community college would have the need and might have the money to utilize the exclusive services of a professional development facilitator. Probably a more frequent and viable solution, at least in the experimental years, would be for a multi-campus district to make this a district position serving all campuses.

Whatever the set-up, college, district, or consortium, the professional development facilitator should be looked upon and used strictly as a staff officer. He would derive his initial and formal authority from the college president or the district superintendent and would need full backing at least until he and his program established intrinsic authority. He would work as a colleague and as a staff man with the dean of instruction. Great care should be taken to clearly delineate the line functions of the dean from the staff functions of the professional development facilitator. He would be deeply, almost singly, concerned with the professional development of instructors, but would be divorced from any aspect of evaluation that touches on the question of retention or dismissal.

Candidates for the professional development facilitator position would be recruited by the chief administrative officers of the college and/or the district, carefully screened by a college or district-wide selection committee, and, with the advice and consent of the college president and/or the district superintendent, nominated by the selection committee for endorsement by the college board of trustees. Men and women recruited and selected for this position of professional development facilitator will be those who eschew line administration, yet they will be very talented, well-educated people and will be able to command adequate compensation. It is recommended that at the college level this staff position be equivalent to that of associate dean and at the district level it have the status and the salary of that of dean.

Before moving on to such specific subjects as salaries and to the wider issue of comparative costs, it would be valuable to take another wide-angle look at this internship model. Perhaps this can be done best with a recapitulation that shows who is doing what and when they are doing it. Table 1 presents this in the form of a calendar of expectancies.

Comparative Costs

In happier days when education was reasonably affluent, a proposal such as this one would be accepted or rejected on the basis of its intrinsic value. It is a commentary on the

Table 1

THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM: A CALENDAR OF EXPECTANCIES

	Year 0			Year 1			
	Spring		August	Fall		Mid-Year	Spring
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR	Searches for new interns in graduate schools, industry, business, etc.	Consults with faculty, students, and professional development facilitator on the hiring of interns.	Supports and participates in the August seminar.	Coordinates intern "function studies" in various college offices.	Begins judgmental evalution of interns. Takes active interest and role in seminar.	Supports and participates in retreat.	Concludes judgmental evaluation of interns. Begins search for next year.
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR	Reviews and disseminates information on college needs, problems, and goals for Year 1. Initially screens intern candidates.	Prepares summer reading for interns. Plans intensive seminar for August.	Leads seminar. Reviews latest research findings and methods. Coordinates all other activities of the internship	Continues seminar. Helps interns in course planning and in solving daily teaching problems. Plans mid-year retreat. Arranges for consultants as needed.	Gives individual assistance to each intern. Gives feedback to interns. Continues seminar. Arranges for T-groups.	Leads mid-year retreat.	Provides intensive evaluation and individual help to interns. Concludes seminar. Provides feedback to interns. Brings in other consultants
EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER	Assists in screening of intern candidates.		Division chairmen support seminar and contribute as needed.	Develops a one-to-one working relationship with interns. Joins in seminar.	Continues intensive guidance and non-judgmental evaluation of interns. Continues in seminar and becomes an active member of the T-group.	Participates in mid-year retreat.	A second and different experienced faculty member takes over role of mentor and advisor to intern.
INTERN	Completes academic preparation to MA level or equivalent.	Reads background material. Visits other colleges.	Deeply engages in seminar. Develops course based on intense personal and philosophic examination. Begins directed reading.	Teaches 2 class sections. Consults with professional development facilitator. Works intimately with his experienced faculty member. Reviews and experiments with teaching tactics. Evaluates his teaching. Continues directed reading. Conducts "function studies."	Assimilates feedback. Is an active participant in T-group. Makes cognitive and emotional adjustments. Continues seminar, teaching, and "function study." Evaluates self and gives feedback to professional development facilitator.	Mid-year retreat. Intensive cognitive and emotional adjustments. Feedback to professional development facilitator and to administration.	Teaches 2 courses (3 sessions). Continues seminar and "function studies." Continues directed reading. Continues experiments in teaching. Continues self-evaluation. Prepares summary and recommendations for next year's internship program.
STUDENTS	Participate in screening of intern candidates.		Some student leaders will contribute to the seminar.	Help intern in the evaluation of his teaching.	In some cases, a student or so may be invited to participate in T-group.		Continue to assist in evaluation of intern.

times that now an idea, however good, is judged first on whether or not it will cost more money. If indeed it does cost more, it rarely gets to the stage of being judged on its merits. This is an incredible state of affairs for a society whose economic theory is based on investment for long term capital gains and whose history is case-study proof that investment in education has paid off at jackpot porportions.

The real test of value of this model for induction of community college instructors is whether or not it produces better teachers. In this test, it could hardly fail since it would do "something" to improve instructors whereas now "nothing," or at least next to nothing, is being done. Its real evaluation should be post hoc, not a priori, should be should be longitudinal, not deductive. If instructors become more committed to the institutional goals; if instructors become more involved in and proud of what they are doing; if student evaluations begin to say that most instructors are really concerned about them and their education; if the rate of wasteful attrition of students drops significantly; if students of the community college begin to act on the basis of the knowledge and attitudes and values gained; if those going through the internship give positive testimonial to how it helped them; if judgmental evaluation gives high marks to

the products of the internship; if all of these conditions obtain then, in fact, increased cost is justified. But, none of these suggested means of evaluation can be made before the fact--so, objective effort will be made to compare the costs of this model with present costs of hiring community college instructors.

The district to be used in the comparison is Contra Costa Junior College District. It is located in a desirable section of the San Francisco Bay Area. It has two colleges of high reputation and a third college on the drawing boards. It has one of the best salary schedules in California and probably better than most in the nation.

The comparison posits the actual salary costs of those hired against the hypothetical costs of hiring interns according to the specifications of this model. The comparison covers the academic years 1968-1969, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971 and, to make the comparison fair and more meaningful, will be accumulative across the three-year period.[9] The cost comparison will be shown in Table 2 and then summary comments will be made in the text.

During the three-year period, Contra Costa Junior College District actually hired 144 full contract instructors with total salary costs adding to $3,211,700. If the internship model had been followed during this same three-year period,

Table 2

COMPARISON OF SALARY COSTS IN CONTRA COSTA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT FOR 1968-1969, 1969-1970, AND 1970-1971 WITH HYPOTHETICAL SALARY COSTS OF THIS INTERNSHIP PROPOSAL

	Contra Costa Junior College District						Hypothetical Internship Model					
	1968-1969		1969-1970		1970-1971		1968-1969		1969-1970		1970-1971	
Salary Class	# Hired	Cost	# Hired	Cost	# Hired	Cost	# Hired	Cost	# Hired	Cost	# Hired	Cost
I: BA	0	$	2	$ 16,000	1	$ 10,005	0	$	2	$ 16,000	1	$ 8,560
II: BA+15	6	59,300	7	69,050	0		8	66,800	8	67,600	0	
III: BA+30 MA	6	58,600	12	120,750	11	111,495	42	365,400	51	453,900	41	390,443
IV: BA+45 MA+15	12	119,800	13	142,250	7	79,664						
V: BA+60 MA+30	4	44,000	5	53,050	5	58,690						
VI: BA+75 MA+45	5	50,750	8	100,450	9	112,193						
VII: BA+90 MA+60 PhD	5	54,100	14	178,150	12	162,908						
Total New Positions and Salaries	38	$386,550	61	$679,700	45	$534,955	50*	$432,200	61**	$537,500	42***	$399,003
I						$18,084						$18,084
II				63,750		146,358				71,200		156,224
III				63,300		169,605				392,700		950,557
IV				130,200		303,567						
V				48,200		112,674						
VI				55,750		173,396						
VII				59,800		263,761						
Accumulative Salaries from Previous Year(s)				$421,100		$1,189,445				$463,900		$1,124,865
Total of New Salaries				$679,700		$ 534,955				$537,500		$399,003
Grand Total (Accum. + New)	38	$386,550	99	$1,100,800	144	$1,724,400	50	$432,200	111	$1,001,400	153	$1,523,868
Comparative Grand Total for Three-Year Period				$3,211,700						$2,957,468		

* Since interns would average only about a 3/4 teaching load, it would take 50 interns to equal 38 regular instructors.

** If all 50 interns from 1968-1969 were kept, the overage of 12 would exactly equal the number needed to compensate for the 3/4 teaching load; hence, by coincidence, the number of interns hired would also be 61.

*** Again, at the end of 1969-1970 there would be an overage of 12 (111-99) teachers; hence, the 1970-1971 need for 45 teachers would be reduced to 33, but to compensate for the 3/4 teaching load, 42 interns would be needed.

the District would have had 153 interns developed into teachers at a total salary cost of $2,957,468. There would have been a three-year net gain of nine instructors and a three-year net salary savings of $254,232. Actually, the net gain of nine instructors can be seen as an advantage in either of two ways. As long as the district maintains the internship program this "overage" compensates for the fact that more interns are required since they do not carry a full teaching load. In any year that the district had a sharply reduced need for new staff members, or if the internship program were abandoned, this overage (this net gain) could be cancelled out by reducing the quota to be hired by the same number as the overage. The point is that this internship program allows the district to have a cushion, a built-in guarantee against a staff shortage, and to have this surplus at an appreciable savings. If the projection had been for four years or five years or six years, each additional year would have added salary savings to the $254,232 figure.

To be sure, the comparison might not always come out quite so favorable to the internship model since to get the very best interns, it would occasionally be necessary to hire people who have more than a master's degree thereby putting them in a higher salary classification. Also, no district would want to bind itself exclusively to an internship plan.

No doubt, there would have been some expensive, experienced regular instructors hired during this three-year period. This last factor neither adds to nor subtracts from the fact that, not in the first year but over a three-year period, an internship program for new instructors would be cheaper. To repeat, if this were projected out to five years or ten years, it would represent a progressively increased saving.

The price that is now paid for pre-service preparation and for in-service preparation is not much in dollar outlay, for most community college instructors get very little of either. The real price now being paid is that of high professional salaries going to those instructors who, forgivably, start their careers as amateurs but who, unforgivably, also end their careers as amateurs. To be sure, most community college instructors eventually educate themselves to be professional teachers, but, more often than not. this takes a long time, and many students suffer frcm their incompetence while they are doing it.

The price that would have to be paid for this year-long internship program would not be cheap. Continuing to use the Contra Costa Junior College District as the example, the professional development facilitator, pegged at the dean's level, would have earned approximately $25,000 per year, or $75,000 during the 1968-1971 sample period.

The biggest cost to the district would be in honoraria awarded to the experienced faculty members who would be giving daily assistance to the interns. The figure proposed was $750 per semester or $1500 per year. When multiplied by the number of interns this would have amounted to $75,000 in 1968-1969, $91,500 in 1969-1970, and $63,000 in 1970-1971.

The three year total would be $229,500, which is a pocketful of money. Remember, however, that over 80% of the operating budget of Contra Costa District, or any other junior college district, goes for salaries. The honoraria to master teachers would simply be a premium paid to help insure that there would be value received for the millions paid out in salaries. Equally important to remember is the adage that the best way to learn something is to try to teach it. During that three year period there would have been a possible pool of 306 experienced faculty members deeply involved in trying to make professional teachers out of the interns. It is hard to think of a more sure-fire way of stimulating the entire faculty to engage itself in professional development.

The other major expense called for by this model is that of outside consultants. The extent to which they would be used would depend upon the competencies and the voids of the professional development facilitator. No doubt these specialists could often be drawn from the multiple talents of the

district staff. Some, the group process specialist for example, would and should be imported from outside. If it is assumed that consultants would be used on the average of twice a week and that the standard fee is $100, this would add to about $7,200 for each academic year (36 weeks) or a three year total of $21,600. Travel and per diem would probably increase this to an average of $10,000 a year or $30,000 for the three year period. Since bringing in consultants represents Mohammed going to the mountain as opposed to the mountain going to Mohammed, most districts would find that $10,000 could be lopped from the annual budget for state, regional, and national conferences and, by virtue of this substitution, get much more value for the dollars spent.

Table 3 summarizes the costs of the hypothetical internship model for the three academic years 1968-1969, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971.

Table 3

COSTS FOR THE HYPOTHETICAL INTERNSHIP MODEL

	1968-1969	1969-1970	1970-1971
Professional Development Facilitator	$ 24,012	$ 24,686	$ 25,360
Honoraria for Experienced Faculty Members	75,000	91,500	63,000
Consultant Fees	7,200	7,200	7,200
Travel and Per Diem	2,800	2,800	2,800
Total	$ 109,012	$ 126,186	$ 98,360

Three Year Grand Total $ 333,558

So, the three year operational costs of the internship model ($333,558) would exceed the salary savings ($254,232) by $89,326, or an out-of-budget cost to the district of about $30,000 per year.

Summary Argument

The logic that has been advanced in this proposal runs along this line. Millions of "new students" are going to flood the nation's community colleges. Tens of thousands of community college instructors will be needed--and soon. It takes master teachers to maximize the potential of these diverse, often high-risk, students. Master teachers are not being created by the present pre-service and in-service preparation of community college instructors. By and large, senior colleges and universities should be written off as a hopeless source for securing these master teachers. In most districts, present in-service training programs should be recognized as a false promise, as a sham which must be exposed before corrective action will be taken. The place to make subject area specialists into talented instructors is the community college itself. The time to make subject area specialists into top quality instructors is during their first year of teaching. The way to bring about this metamorphosis is a year-long, highly enriched internship program.

This internship model would guarantee some desirable outcomes and would at least be predisposing toward others. It would make for a younger faculty since the annual complement of interns would be mostly men and women in their mid-twenties, fresh out of the graduate schools. This apprenticeship model would give the intern a largely subsidized year but would pressure him, within that year, to make an honest assessment of his potential as a community college instructor. Such an internship would give the college a fair chance to help each intern to succeed without forcing the college into all the negative and defensive tactics that presently grow out of the "instant tenure" provisions. The year-long seminar would oblige every instructor, at the very beginning of his career, to think deeply (and publicly) about the compatibility of his own philosophic assumptions with the tenets upon which community college education rests. This form of preparation would allow no blindness to the diverse nature of the community college student body nor any escape from the issue of designing an education that speaks to the needs of such students. Early on, the interns would become aware that the classroom function was not the only function served by the college, and this understanding should result in greater tolerance and a willingness to cooperate in team efforts. The list of benefits would not end here, but perhaps all others can be summarized in the

notion that the internship would significantly contribute to the professionalization of community college education.

A hypothetical calculation has been made showing that the savings in lower initial salaries would almost match in the short run, and more than match in the long run, the costs to a community college district of operating such a program of staff development. Most junior college districts are too close to financial insolvency to risk high stakes on hypothetical calculations. To be sure, some districts are already persuaded that internship is the only viable method of inducting new staff members. Doubtless, such districts would be willing to share risks while the whole scheme is being evaluated throughout a three year trial run. What is needed is state, federal, or foundation money to encourage a college district (districts?) to share the risks in such a validation. An equitable division of support would be for the college district to guarantee full salaries to the interns while the extra-mural funding agency would pick up the tab for the salary of the professional development facilitator, the honoraria for the experienced faculty members, and the fees and travel expenses of the consultants.

SUPPORTING REFERENCES

1. Jencks, C. and Riesman, D., The Academic Revolution, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.

2. Medsker, L. and Tillery, D., Breaking the Access Barrier, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

3. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open-Door Colleges, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

4. Stinnett, T. M., A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, 1970 Edition, Washington, D.C.: The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, N.E.A., 1970.

5. Phair, Tom S., "New Full-Time Faculty Members in the 91 Public Community Colleges of California, 1969-1970 Academic Year," Unpublished report of the Office of Educational Career Services, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

6. Warburton, T. Stanley, "Community College Staff Development in California," Unpublished paper, Chaffey College, July 24, 1971.

7. Illich, Ivan, "The Alternative to Schooling," Saturday Review, June 19, 1971.

8. Goodman, Paul, Compulsory Miseducation, New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

9. Carhart, John, "Salary Schedules and Placements Thereon of New Professional Staff for Academic Years 1968-69, 1969-70, and 1970-71," Martinez: Contra Costa Junior College District, 1971.